

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Willie White, Jr., et al.,)	C. A. No. 2:00-3215-RBH-RSC
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
-versus-)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u>
)	
State of Carolina, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Willie White, Jr., brought this DNA action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 2, 2008, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. By order of this court filed July 3, 2008, pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), White was advised of dismissal and summary judgment procedures and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. On August 18, 2008, White was granted an extension until September 17, 2008, to file his response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment. White did not respond.

Since White is proceeding pro se, the court filed a second order on November 21, 2008, giving White an additional ten (10) days in which to file a response to the defendants' motion for summary judgment. White was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action may be dismissed as to him with prejudice for failure to prosecute, Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978), 41(b) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

To date, White has not responded to the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

Accordingly, it appears that White no longer wishes to pursue this action. It is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution as to Willie White, Jr.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert S. Carr". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "R" and a cursive "Carr".

Robert S. Carr
United States Magistrate Judge

Charleston, South Carolina

December 12, 2008

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P.O. Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).